

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-24 are now pending in the application. Independent Claim 8 has been cancelled. Claims 11, 12 and 16 have been amended into independent format by this amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview granted on May 24, 2006 with Applicants' representative. During the interview Claim 17 was discussed in light of Meginnis. Also, the amendment to Claim 17 included herein was discussed. During the interview an agreement was reached that the amendment to Claim 17 would place Claim 17 in condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 8-10, 14, 15 and 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Meginnis (U.S. Pat. No. 3,864,199). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 8 has been cancelled, therefore, the rejection thereto is rendered moot. Claim 9 has been amended to depend from amended independent Claim 12; Claim 10 depends indirectly from amended independent Claim 12; Claim 14 depends from Claim 12; and Claim 15 has been amended to depend from Claim 12. Claim 12 has been amended into independent format to include each of the limitations of the claim from which it depended, and as noted in the office action, is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Claims 9-10, 14, and 15 are also be in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 17 has been amended in a minor and non-narrowing fashion to define the scope of Claim 17. In particular, independent Claim 17 recites “a method of cooling a structure, comprising: forming a selected pore having a structure to allow only a substantially unidirectional flow of a coolant”. Although Meginnis discloses that air can be supplied under pressure to an interior of the blades so that it flows through the pores 8, Meginnis does not disclose that a pore is formed to have a structure to allow a substantially unidirectional flow of coolant. As discussed above, the Examiner agreed that this amendment would place Claim 17 in condition for allowance and the Examiner is willing to enter the present amendment to Claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent Claim 17, and each of the claims that depend directly or indirectly therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of Claims 1-7 and 24.

The Office Action indicates that Claims 11-13 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants further thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in these claims and have amended Claims 11, 12, and 16 into independent format. Therefore, these claims should be in condition for allowance. Further, Claims 9-10 and 13-15 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 12, and therefore should also be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6-1-06

By: 

Michael L. Taylor
Reg. No. 50,521

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

SJF/RWW/MLT